Greenfield Stein & Senior, LLP Attorneys at Law 600 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016

MEMO ENDORSE (212) 818-9600 EXX: (212) 818-1264

E-MAIL: PSHOEMAKER@GSS-LAW.COM

HARVEY E. CORN GARY B. FREIDMAN ALAN E. KATZ JEFFREY H. SCHNEIDER NORMAN A. SENIOR PAUL T. SHOEMAKER KENNETH L. STEIN LESLIE J. WILSHER

March 11, 2008

USDS SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED:

Honorable Kenneth M. Karas United States District Judge United States Courthouse 300 Ouarropas Street Room 533 White Plains, NY 10601

Re:

Vetromile v. JPI Partners, LLC

07 Civ. 11032 (KMK) Our File No. 6655-2

Dear Judge Karas:

I am writing to follow up on the jury trial issue in this matter. At the initial conference on February 29, this issue was raised but not resolved.

Subdivision (c) of Rule 81 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure addresses the matter of jury demands in removed actions.

Unfortunately, however, as has been noted, cases removed from New York State courts typically fall within a grey area not covered by Rule 81(c). See Vincent v. AST Research Inc., 199 F.R.D. 95, 96 (N.D.N.Y. 2001).

The Court of Appeals has set forth guidelines for determining how to handle this issue. See Higgins v. Boeing Co., 526 F.2d 1004, 1007 (2nd Cir. 1975). As applied in the Vincent case, supra, it is clear that, under those guidelines, a demand for a jury should be permitted and upheld where it is made at an early stage of the case such that there can be no prejudice to the defendant from granting a jury trial.

Case 7:07-cv-11032-KMK Document 8 Filed 03/17/2008 Page 2 of 2

Honorable Kenneth M. Karas United States District Judge March 11, 2008 Page 2

In the present case, discovery notices have not even been served. Accordingly, there can be no prejudice to the defendant, and plaintiff respectfully demands a jury and requests that that demand be allowed by the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

PTS:jo

cc: Neil G. Sparber, Esq.

Descendant is to regard to this Leter by March 24, 2006.